

REGULAR MEETING OF  
Canby City Council, October 16, 1961.

The meeting was called to order by the Mayor at 8 p.m.

Roll Call: Present - Mayor Oliver and Councilmen Giger, Graham, Housen, Markee, Onion and Stefani. Absent - None.

Others Present - Attorney Bettis and Chief of Police Younce.

Minutes of the meeting of October 2 were read and approved.

Excerpts from a letter from the Governor's office urging the employment of the Physically handicapped, was read and noted. The Recorder gave a report of a visit to the Recorder's office in St. Helens to observe office procedure and modernization.

Mayor Oliver declared that the time had arrived to open and read bids for a new police car, as advertised September 28 and October 5, 1961. The following bids were opened and read in order of receipt:

Fields Chev. Co.	Net - \$2232.96	Less trade-in - 700.00,	Cost to City \$1532.96
Eversole Motors	" 3073.10	" " "&Tax 1554.10,	" " " 1519.00
Sam's Garage	" 2925.65	" " " 1410.00	" " " 1515.00
Holman-Williams Co.	Difference - 1750.	Less Tax - 180.00	" " " 1570.00

A motion was made by Councilman Housen, seconded by Giger and carried unanimously that the bid of Sam's Garage in the amount of \$1515.00 be accepted as being in the best interest of the City of Canby.

Police Commissioner Housen announced that five applicants for the position of police officer were present for the purpose of personal interviews. Mayor Oliver directed that the following applicants be, and they were interviewed individually, by the Council: Tommy H. Kateley, Frank E. Raffety, Daniel M. Danton, Harold W. Michael and Burton L. Lindsay. Upon completion of the interviews, the Mayor directed the Recorder to poll the Council for the Choice by order of the five candidates. Results were 2 first and 4 second choices voted for Kateley and 4 first and 2 second choice votes for Lindsay. Commissioner Housen then advised the applicants of the results and presented Kateley and Lindsay as the newly selected police officers of the City of Canby.

A motion was made by Councilman Giger, seconded by Onion and carried unanimously by roll call vote that claims against the City be approved and warrants drawn on the Treasurer in payment thereof.

Mayor Oliver reported that he had attended a portion of the sessions of the League of Oregon Cities Convention that day and would attend more on Tuesday. The Recorder announced that he and Fire Chief Christiansen intended to attend the convention throughout the day on Tuesday.

The Recorder reported that the Canby Union Bank had delivered to the City, certificates of collateral security in the amount of \$272,000.

A motion was made by Councilman Giger, seconded by Stefani and carried unanimously that Resolution No. XXXI be adopted, thereby appointing Councilman Glenn Onion and Fire Chief Norman Christiansen as surplus property representatives for the City of Canby.

Mayor Oliver reported that demolition of the Dedman building at 336 NW 1st Ave. had been held up temporarily but that progress would be made soon.

The Council approved a sewer agreement with Wayne Conner, subject to payment of the prescribed \$500 fee.

It was announced that the Planning Commission meeting, scheduled for October 18, would be held on October 25.

Mayor Oliver called a special meeting of the Council for 8 p.m. on Monday, October 23 to conduct unfinished regular business.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

  
Mayor

  
City Recorder

Canby, Oregon  
Oct. 16th. 1961

Hon. Mayor and fellow Councilmen:

The City of Canby contract with the Bonneville Power Administrator was executed March 2nd. 1951.

The contract provides that its provisions shall be effective for the term of twenty (20) years.

Section 9 under heading of "General Provisions" reads in part:  
" The City's investment in its electric system shall be deemed to be \$27,877.78 as of the time this contract takes effect."

RELATING TO PURCHASERS OPERATING POLICIES.

The contract reads: The Purchaser may pay into the City's General Fund during each year, in lieu of taxes, from electric revenues available therefor, an amount not exceeding five (5) percent of the gross electric revenues derived during such year.

Also that the purchaser may pay into the General Fund each month as a return on the City's investment in its electric system an amount not exceeding one half of one percent ( $\frac{1}{2}\%$ ) of the investment in the purchaser's electric system made from the City's General Fund.

\*-----\*

Although there have been continual or periodical increases in wages and costs of materials and maintenance during the past ten year life of this contract, there has apparently been no review or effort on the part of the City to secure an upward revision of percentages and allowances to the General fund from the original investment or from gross current electric revenues. The Bonneville management may at this time be willing to consider some revisions in this respect.

At present the monthly payment to the General Fund at  $\frac{1}{2}\%$  per month on the City's investment is \$139.39. If the Contract could be revised to permit  $\frac{3}{4}$  of one percent, the monthly return would be \$209.08 - an increase of \$69.69 per month.

Likewise if the percentage on the gross intake could be increased to  $6\frac{1}{2}\%$  this would bring an additional revenue of approximately \$168.50 per month.

From both sources the increase would approximately be \$238.19 per month of \$2,858.28 annually.

Such an agreement would in no way impose any burden on the efficient and economical management of the Light and power department which has been so conservatively managed that customers are being served at a rate of .79 cents per KWH - one of the lowest rates in Oregon. In addition the annual audit as of the close of the fiscal year 1961 reveals surplus reserves in the Light and Power department of \$63,389.08.

Respectfully submitted,

  
A. S. Markee

Canby, Ore Oct 16th 1961

Hon. Mayor and fellow Councilmen:

The City of Canby contract with the Bonneville Power Administrator was executed March 2nd, 1951.

The contract provides that its provisions shall be effective for the term of twenty (20) years.

Section 9 under heading of "General Provisions" reads in part: "The City's investment in its electric system shall be deemed to be \$27,877.78 as of the time this contract takes effect".

RELATING TO PURCHASERS OPERATING POLICIES.

The contract reads: The Purchaser may pay into the City's General Fund during each year, in lieu of taxes, from electric revenues available therefor, an amount not exceeding five (5) percent of the gross electric revenues derived during such year.

Also that the purchaser may pay into the General Fund each month, as a return on the City's investment in its electric system an amount not exceeding one half of one percent ( $\frac{1}{2}\%$ ) of the investment in the Purchaser's electric system made from the City's General Fund.

-----

Although there have been continual or periodical increases in wages and costs of materials and maintenance during the past ten year life of this contract, there has apparently been no review or effort on the part of the City to secure an upward revision of percentages and allowances to the General fund from the original investment or from gross current electric revenues. The Bonneville Management may at this time be willing to consider some revisions in this respect.

At present the monthly payment to the General Fund at  $\frac{1}{2}\%$  per month on the City's investment is \$139.39. If the Contract could be revised to permit  $\frac{3}{4}$  of one percent, the monthly return would be \$209.08 - an increase of \$69.69 per month.

Likewise if the percentage on the gross intake could be increased to  $6\frac{1}{2}\%$  this would bring an additional revenue of approximately \$168.50 per month.

From both sources the increase would be approximately \$238.19 per month or \$2,858.28 annually.

Such an agreement would in no way impose any burden on the efficient and economical management of the Light and power department which has been so conservatively managed that customers are being served at a rate of .79 cents per KWH - one of the lowest rates in Oregon. In addition the annual audit as of the close of the fiscal year 1961 reveals surplus reserves in the Light and Power department of \$63,389.08.

Respectfully submitted,

A S Markee



Re 10% surcharge for electric services outside the City limits by the City of Eugene.

While investigating consideration of fringe area surcharges was curious to know when this surcharge was established and why. My inquiry developed the following information:

This surcharge was assessed in 1916 at which time the Eugene Water and Light Board was formed and took over the electric system operated at that time by some private interests.

The City of Eugene issued General Obligation bonds for the purchase of this electric system. These bonds were of course the obligation of the tax payers within the City. The management therefor felt that if they were to grant electric services to customers outside the City who were not paying any City taxes, that in lieu of an equivalent to the tax cost to those within the City, the outside customers should pay a 10% surcharge.

The present City managers now advise that there is considerable amount of criticism from these outside users and that it is effecting their public relations to the point now where they are doubting the benefits of this policy and are currently feeling that this surcharge is having a negative rather than a positive effect and further state that they do not feel that it is of any assistance in relation to annexations.

Respectfully submitted,



A.S. Markee

A REPORT ON FALL-OUT SHELTERS

Canby Public Works Superintendent during the past two months has contacted quite a number of authorities and professional people who are more or less directly interested in the subject matter. The following is a general outline of the thinking of these people regarding fall-out shelters:

Home fall-out shelters in which there is a newly aroused public interest requires some more design attention and assurance of better construction if they are to justify their promise of safety for those outside or on the fringes of a nuclear blast. Insofar as protection against radiation is concerned, the home shelter designs developed by the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization (available in a 10¢ booklet from the U. S. Government Printing Office) are no doubt adequate but they are still shortcomings represented by impractical ventilation equipment, inadequate waste and sewage disposal and the possibility of shoddy construction.

The danger of shoddy construction arises from the too great encouragement being given to do it yourself building. Also, as pointed out by the House of Representatives Government Operations Committee early this month, the shelter market is attracting fly-by-night operators. The Committee warned shelter buyers not to proceed without first consulting local authorities. Logically, this group should include a top building official as well as a Civil Defense personnel. For public safety, all plans and construction of home shelters and mass shelters should be inspected by a local building official.

Unsafe ventilation may result from filters that may pass radioactive dust or that may become clogged. To prevent this hazard, the new office of Civil Defense should issue more specific requirements and designed details than has been issued to date.

Use of hand blowers for shelter air supply is another hazard, since occupancy of shelters may be necessary for long periods. Elimination of danger of suffocation from human failure would be possible if a low cost battery operated blower were available. Office of Civil Defense should stimulate research and development of such ventilating equipment.

Waste and sewage disposal would not be a serious consideration were it not for the odor problem of the recommended disposal method. Method--deposit in pails. For short stays in a shelter, chemicals could easily be an answer, but for long periods close confinement with sewage disposal pails could lead to premature abandonment of the shelter. The maximum duration of stay in a shelter should in fact be a prime criterion of shelter design. Giving credence to the possibility of short stays can only lead to inadequate provisions for living in shelters.

Perhaps the answer to the waste disposal problem is to encourage shelter owners to spend more money to get a more suitable system such as a chemical toilet, a detached toilet or some kind of mechanical ejector. There is additional opportunity and need for more research in this area of shelter design.

The House Committee recently concluded that private individual shelters are impractical for most Americans, but they need not be if reputable contractors, manufacturers, engineers and designers would take over this market before fly-by-nighters ruin it and if research can unearth economical solutions to problems still needing attention--principally waste, disposal and ventilation. Then shelters in the case of need would become a more workable and dependable piece of construction.